

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK (BROOKLYN)

3 GILEAD SCIENCES, INC., et al,

4 Plaintiffs,

5 v.

6 SAFE CHAIN SOLUTIONS, LLC, et  
7 al,

8 Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-04106-AMD-JAM

Brooklyn, New York  
March 27, 2024  
12:06 p.m.

9 TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING  
10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH A. MARUTOLLO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 APPEARANCES:

12 For the Plaintiffs:  
(Gilead Sciences, Inc.)

Timothy A. Waters, Esq.  
Maxwell K. Weiss, Esq.  
Thomas P. Kurland, Esq.  
George Soussou, Esq.  
Andrew I. Haddad, Esq.  
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler,  
LLP  
1133 Ave of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

13  
14 For the Defendants:  
(Safe Chain Solutions, LLC)

Matthew S. Krauss, Esq.  
Weisbrod Matteis & Copley, PLLC  
3000 K Street NW  
Suite 275  
Washington, DC 20007

15  
16 For the Defendant:  
(Mohammad Etminan and  
Total Remedy Pharmacy)

Matthew Jacobs, Esq.  
Jacobs Law Group  
3435 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.,  
#3492  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91359

17  
18 For the Defendant:  
(Worldwide Pharma Sales  
Group, Inc. and Adam  
Brosius)

Mark A. Berman, Esq.  
Hartmann Doherty Rosa Berman &  
Bulbulia, LLP  
433 Hackensack Avenue, Suite 1002  
Hackensack, NJ 07601

1 Appearances (continued) :

2 For the Defendant: Ryan D. Rainey, Esq.  
3 (Propharma Distribution, Quarles & Brady, LLP  
LLC) 33 East Main Street  
Ste 900  
Madison, WI 53703

5 For the Defendant: Robert E. B. Hewitt, III  
6 (Lin Pharmacy Inc., Samuel Schwartz, Conroy & Hack, PC  
Yakubov, Monica Ngo) 666 Old Country Road  
9th Floor  
Garden City, NY 11530

7

8 Clerk: E.G.

9 Court Recorder: Electronic Sound Recording

10 Transcription Service: Chris Hwang  
11 Abba Reporting  
PO Box 223282  
12 Chantilly, Virginia 20153  
(518) 302-6772

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;  
25 transcript produced by transcription service.

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
Court's ruling	20
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 (Call to order at 12:06 p.m.)

2 THE CLERK: I will now ask everyone to unmute their  
3 phone. Thank you.

4 Docket number 21-CV-4106, Gilead Sciences, Inc. v.  
5 Safe Chain Solutions, LLC. Will the parties please state their  
6 appearances for the record, starting with Plaintiff?

7 MR. WATERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Timothy  
8 Waters from Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler on behalf of the  
9 Plaintiffs. I'm joined by my colleagues Thomas Kurland,  
10 Maxwell Weiss, George Soussou, and Andrew Haddad.

11 MR. KRAUSS: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Matthew  
12 Krauss of Weisbrod Matteis & Copley for the Safe Chain parties.

13 MR. JACOBS: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Matt Jacobs  
14 on behalf of Mohammed Etminan and Total Remedy Pharmacy.

15 MR. BERMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Mark A.  
16 Berman with Hartmann Doherty Rosa Berman on behalf of Adam  
17 Brosius and Worldwide Pharma.

18 MR. RAINES: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Ryan Rainey  
19 from Quarles & Brady on behalf of Propharma Distribution, LLC.

20 MR. HEWITT: Your Honor, Robert Hewitt from Schwartz,  
21 Conroy & Hack on behalf of Lin Pharmacy, Samuel Yakubov, and  
22 Monica Ngo.

23 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. So, good afternoon,  
24 everyone. We're here for a status conference. And I wanted to  
25 address a few items at least on my list, and then, I'm happy to

1 talk further if there are specific items that need to be raised  
2 with anyone.

3 So, first, I appreciate the parties' efforts over the  
4 last few months to try to resolve this case or at least  
5 portions of this case.

6 I know some -- at least in the last couple months,  
7 we've had some resolutions. And others, you know, I think  
8 there have been good negotiations.

9 I encourage the parties to continue those  
10 negotiations. And, you know, to the extent it's helpful, I'm  
11 happy to hold either a renewed settlement conference or a  
12 settlement conference separately with the parties.

13 Let me just turn first to something that -- I don't  
14 think anyone is on for Ms. Lopez, but I know there's a pending  
15 motion for an order to show cause that has been referred to me  
16 by Judge Donnelly. That's at docket entry number 1327.

17 Let me hear a little bit further on where things  
18 stand there from Gilead?

19 MR. WATERS: Yes, Your Honor, this is Timothy Waters.  
20 The reason that was filed as an order to show cause, Your  
21 Honor, is we have an asset freeze against Ms. Lopez. In  
22 violation of that freeze, well, we've learned recently that  
23 she's violated that freeze in a couple ways in the past.

24 But the big issue is that she is moving to sell her  
25 multimillion dollar home in violation of the freeze. And she

1 has a -- we've learned that she has a contract of sale that's  
2 supposed to close I believe on April 4th.

3           And so, the request was, although we have to deal  
4 with her past issues of contempt, we wanted to do this as an  
5 order to show cause to get her to respond quickly because the  
6 order -- the immediate prejudice we're trying to avoid is an  
7 order not prohibiting the sale of the home since there's a  
8 third-party buyer involved that seems to be arm's length, but  
9 rather, to prevent her from dissipating the proceeds of that  
10 sale by requiring her after the mortgage is paid off to pay the  
11 proceeds into the Court's escrow.

12           Because she has a history of violating the Court's  
13 order, we're concerned that if that sale goes through without  
14 further action, that money's just going to disappear.

15           And of course, the whole point of the asset freeze  
16 was to have assets that she couldn't spend or dissipate to  
17 satisfy a judgment.

18           Ms. Lopez --

19           THE COURT: So I think that answers my first  
20 question, because one thing I was a little bit unclear about  
21 was whether there was any prohibition in the asset freeze order  
22 or the seizure order from I believe August 22nd. Is that  
23 right, August 22nd, 2023?

24           MR. WATERS: That sounds correct, but I don't have it  
25 in front of me.

1                   THE COURT: What about there's a prohibition on  
2 selling property? It sounds like there was not a prohibition  
3 on selling property, right?

4                   MR. WATERS: I apologize, Your Honor. There was.  
5 She was required to disclose real property. She disclosed the  
6 property that she is trying to sell.

7                   It freezes all of her assets, but there is a specific  
8 line on the asset freeze order, and we call it out in our  
9 papers, prohibiting her from encumbering, transferring,  
10 selling, et cetera any real property in which she has an  
11 interest.

12                  This property is owned by an LLC, but it's an LLC  
13 that she created. It's a single member LLC. And she testified  
14 that she's the one who caused the LLC to be made. She caused  
15 this home to be purchased. And she's the one who's involved in  
16 the sale. She's the one signing all the documents on behalf of  
17 the LLC with regard to the home.

18                  And it's the home she's lived in for the past two  
19 years. It's a home where we did the seizure when we did a  
20 seizure against her. It's her primary residence despite the  
21 fact that it's owned by an LLC.

22                  And in the papers, we describe why. In fact, she  
23 testified that she understood that the asset freeze order  
24 prevented her from selling this property.

25                  THE COURT: Okay, and apologies, the home is

1       scheduled to close I believe on April 3rd. How is that  
2       information conveyed to Gilead? Is that something you can  
3       share publicly?

4                    MR. WATERS: Yeah, we had issued a subpoena. When we  
5       first learned that she had through her testimony that she had  
6       an interest in this property and had sold a previous property,  
7       which again, is a previous violation that's not urgent, but  
8       needs to be remedied, we learned that she was involved in this  
9       house.

10                  And we'd issued a subpoena to a real estate agent she  
11      knew she was connected with. And then, at some point, that  
12      real estate agent, I believe I'm getting this correct, sent us  
13      the contract of sale.

14                  THE COURT: All right, and let's say that sale goes  
15      forward on April 3rd. Why are the proceeds then governed by  
16      the asset freeze order?

17                  MR. WATERS: Because those would be proceeds paid to  
18      her or paid to the LLC that she wholly controls. And the asset  
19      freeze freezes and prohibits her from spending any assets,  
20      liquid or real estate.

21                  THE COURT: And how -- let's say that sale goes  
22      forward on April 3rd. How, if at all, would you propose  
23      modifying the current proposed order that you've attached as  
24      one of -- on the docket here in which you're arguing that Ms.  
25      Lopez should be held in contempt and a variety of other things?

1                   MR. WATERS: So the order that we proposed is that  
2 the buyer of the home pays the proceeds of the more -- of the  
3 sale not to Ms. Lopez, because she's shown that will not follow  
4 the asset freeze order, but rather to the Clerk of the Court,  
5 will be held in escrow and effectively frozen.

6                   Ms. Lopez, you know, the way these asset freeze  
7 orders work, they bind the Defendant, but I can only serve them  
8 on banks where I know she has a bank account.

9                   So if she were to put them into a new bank account,  
10 that bank would not know about the asset freeze order and she  
11 could dissipate the assets. And in fact, we think that's been  
12 happening for some time now.

13                  So given that the only way -- she's under an asset  
14 freeze order. She can't spend it, but given that she can't be  
15 trusted to follow the order and that she's now selling her  
16 primary asset, one that was purchased with counterfeiting  
17 proceeds, we think the appropriate step is let's take that  
18 money out of her hands, put it in the Court's escrow where it  
19 will remain frozen, so at least these funds we know will not be  
20 dissipated.

21                  THE COURT: I guess what I'm getting at is just as a  
22 practical matter, because this has been referred to me for  
23 report and recommendation and either Defendant or I realize has  
24 not appeared, you know, the -- just want to gather, right,  
25 there would be a time period for which objections to any report

1 and recommendation could be given.

2                 Because if, for instance, I were to recommend the  
3 granting Gilead's motion, how would that play out from your  
4 perspective in terms of, you know, by that point it would be  
5 after April 4th and would go up to the district judge, how  
6 would you -- what would be your proposal at that stage?

7                 MR. WATERS: I believe my proposal would be that  
8 under a temporary basis, the funds are ordered to go into the  
9 Court's escrow.

10                 And in the event that the -- that Ms. Lopez makes  
11 objections to the report and recommendation or the District  
12 Court in a very unlikely scenario in my mind were to disagree  
13 with the report and recommendation, those funds are available  
14 and could be immediately paid back. There's no lasting  
15 prejudice to Ms. Lopez. The sale would go through. Those  
16 funds would be held safe.

17                 And if she were to successfully move for the release  
18 of those funds, they could be released to her immediately. The  
19 danger is that she gets those funds and that they disappear.

20                 THE COURT: And I know you have the affidavit of  
21 service here. Have you had any contact with Ms. Lopez since  
22 the filing of this motion?

23                 MR. WATERS: No, Your Honor. We've emailed her at  
24 every email address we have for her, both the ones we know she  
25 uses and we searched to seize the documents for anything else

1       she used.

2                  We sent it by Fedex to the house where she's living.

3 I believe we've also provided a copy to her real estate agent,  
4 but we have not heard back from her.

5                  THE COURT: All right, anything further that you want  
6 to raise that's either in supplement to your papers or anything  
7 further you want to raise on this issue with Ms. Lopez?

8                  MR. WATERS: I believe we've covered it, Your Honor.  
9 I appreciate you addressing it and understanding the time  
10 urgency.

11                 Mr. Kurland, I know you worked on these as well, is -  
12 -

13                 MR. KURLAND: Yes. I was just going to say, Your  
14 Honor, in the first instance, you know, I believe what's been  
15 referred to you is the order to show cause which, you know, is  
16 the sort of first step directing her to show cause, you know,  
17 on the relief. It's like a TRO.

18                 So that's the sort of quick piece that, you know,  
19 we're -- the posture in which it's come to you is a little  
20 confusing because ordinarily, you know, the Court would sign  
21 that rather quickly because it's like the notice of motion.  
22 And then, she'd have an opportunity to appear and respond and  
23 challenge the relief. So that's sort of the initial piece that  
24 we're trying to get accomplished quickly.

25                 And then, she, you know, pursuant to the order to

1 show cause would have a full and fair opportunity at a time and  
2 place the Court directs to appear and contest the longer term  
3 relief, right?

4 So we're just trying to preserve the status quo  
5 quickly. You know, already almost 10 days have elapsed since  
6 we filed the order to show cause. So that's where we are right  
7 now.

8 THE COURT: Can I ask -- and I realize there's a  
9 lengthy history in this case before I was assigned to it. Why  
10 was this not filed as a temporary restraining order?

11 MR. KURLAND: Well, it was -- I mean, it was done by  
12 the -- I mean, that's why it was done by an order to show  
13 cause.

14 There already is an injunction and she's violating  
15 the injunction. So we -- it would be odd to seek a temporary  
16 restraining order to restrain someone from, you know, it's like  
17 two extra steps. We already did at the commencement of the  
18 case seek a temporary restraining order, which was granted.

19 And then, it was converted to a preliminary  
20 injunction. And now, the proposed sale of the property is in  
21 direct violation of the extant injunction.

22 THE COURT: Okay, so let me get back to you on that.  
23 I'll take all that under advisement.

24 Let me turn to a few other issues that impact I think  
25 everyone. I wanted to get a sense of where things stand with

1 expert discovery.

2 Again, right now, initial expert disclosures are  
3 going to be served by May 14th. Rebuttal expert disclosures  
4 and reports will be served by June 14th. And all expert  
5 discovery is to be completed by July 16th.

6 As I said multiple times, I want to make this as  
7 clear as possible in terms of what the deadlines are, that they  
8 won't be extended absent really extraordinary circumstances.

9 So I guess, first, have there been any expert  
10 disclosures served as of yet? I realize there's still time  
11 before the deadline, but I'm curious on where things stand.

12 MR. WATERS: On behalf of the Plaintiffs, Your Honor,  
13 we haven't served anything yet. We do plan on serving expert  
14 disclosures and we will do so by the 14th. We don't anticipate  
15 any problems meeting the deadlines.

16 THE COURT: From the -- any of the Defendants'  
17 perspective, I realize these are going to be rebuttal experts,  
18 so obviously, it's premature in some ways, but I -- you know,  
19 given the timeline here, are any issues with Defendants want to  
20 be raised at this point about the rebuttal experts or anything  
21 along those lines? Any of the Defendants?

22 MR. JACOBS: Judge, this is Matt Jacobs. You know,  
23 we haven't prepared rebuttal disclosures yet, but you know, to  
24 the extent that Gilead has their disclosures ready before the  
25 May 14th date, there's no obligation for them to provide it,

1       but in the interest of sticking to all these deadlines and  
2       making sure we meet them, you know, obviously, we wouldn't  
3       object to receiving them early.

4                  THE COURT: So that's fair. I mean, I'm sure that  
5       that's a view shared by all of the Defendants. And obviously,  
6       in the interest of time, I think there may be some benefit to  
7       that. I mean, realistically, the expert disclosures here on  
8       the Plaintiff's side, Plaintiff has the burden here, are due  
9       May 14th.

10                 And then, it's a relatively short period of time  
11       although I think fair amount of time by June 14th, but I think,  
12       you know, to the extent Gilead does serve them early, I would  
13       you know, for what it's worth, I would be, you know, if  
14       Gilead's going to serve expert disclosure then on April 1st,  
15       I'd be less inclined to then grant any extensions for  
16       Defendants who are then claiming they need more time,  
17       especially given if Gilead does it early.

18                 Again, I'm not planning on doing extensions  
19       regardless, but for what it's worth, that may be something that  
20       might help push this out.

21                 And I encourage the parties again to, you know,  
22       produce things early whenever it's possible, although I realize  
23       it's a complex litigation that, you know, requires  
24       comprehensive assessments by the proposed experts.

25                 MR. JACOBS: Judge, if I may, I mean, clearly

1 Patterson, Gilead's counsel, has substantial experience in this  
2 niche.

3 And to the extent their experts are the same ones  
4 they've used in prior cases, for example, Abbott, then I think  
5 it's an even less of a difficult lift to produce those, you  
6 know, earlier than later.

7 MR. KURLAND: Well, just to be clear, we are planning  
8 on serving expert reports. It's not just like a 3101(d), like  
9 we have to do the full 26 report, which is case specific. So  
10 that's what's taking time. And we'll get it done. And we'll  
11 serve them in accordance with the schedule.

12 And if we happen to finish it early, we'll certainly  
13 disclose them early, but we -- and at this point, we're aiming  
14 to disclose them in accordance with the schedule.

15 THE COURT: That's fine. I would note that counsel  
16 Mr. Kurland is right in a sense that -- and just for  
17 Defendants' side as well here, you know, the expert disclosures  
18 here are everything that's required under Federal Rule 26. So  
19 it's not just the, you know, fee schedule and CV. It's the  
20 full report. So, you know, just keep that in mind for all  
21 sides.

22 Any other issues related to expert discovery that the  
23 parties would like to address at this point?

24 MR. WATERS: Not on behalf of Plaintiffs, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Any from the Defendants? Okay.

1                   MR. JACOBS: Nothing, Your Honor.

2                   THE COURT: Any other outstanding issues that need to  
3 be addressed, putting aside the Lopez matter for the discovery  
4 side of things?

5                   MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, I have an issue related to  
6 the deposition of Mr. Weinberg that we discussed on the I guess  
7 two-party conference a few days ago.

8                   And I haven't raised this with Gilead yet, but I  
9 think Mr. Etminan in his deposition is limited to 90 minutes,  
10 but there's no limitation on Mr. Weinberg's deposition.

11                  You know, I take Mr. Waters at his word that he's  
12 trying to minimize inconvenience to Mr. Weinberg. And I'm not  
13 necessarily asking for an order, but I just wanted to get a  
14 sense from Gilead whether they expect the deposition not to  
15 exceed 90 minutes?

16                  I think, I mean, if the answer is they expect it to  
17 exceed 90 minutes, I think that may be somewhat unreasonable  
18 given that Mr. Etminan's deposition is cabined at that length.

19                  THE COURT: Does Gilead want to respond?

20                  MR. WATERS: Yeah, so this is Tim Waters. 90 minutes  
21 sounds reasonable to me. The only caveat I have to say is I  
22 don't know what the documents are and I don't know what their  
23 volume is.

24                  If I get 500 documents, and I have to go through half  
25 an hour of just getting to know you, what's your background,

1 how do you know Mr. Etminan, you know, how long have you  
2 practiced law, where I don't have to do that with Mr. Etminan  
3 because I've already, you know, we've already deposed him, I  
4 can see potentially wanting to go slightly over 90 minutes, but  
5 I'm going to stay cabined within the scope of the waiver, which  
6 we've agreed to. It's not going to be a full-day deposition.

7 Without seeing documents, I'm loath to put a time  
8 limit on it. But like I said, I can see me going over 90  
9 minutes just because of the time it takes to ramp up with a new  
10 witness, especially someone I haven't met before and you've  
11 said is advanced in years.

12 THE COURT: Well, again, I'm not going to issue an  
13 order on the length of Mr. Weinberg's deposition. I mean,  
14 there's still a chance that his deposition will not be needed  
15 based on the document production.

16 And also, I would distinguish I think what Mr.  
17 Etminan as counsel noted for Gilead. I mean, there was already  
18 a deposition in place. So the 90 minutes was really just to  
19 make sure that there was sufficient time to address these other  
20 issues.

21 I would just encourage the parties, that they're  
22 already sound like they're doing, just to be efficient and  
23 reasonable, particularly given Mr. Weinberg's situation, you  
24 know, and purpose of the deposition. Okay, anything else from  
25 anyone that needs it raised?

1                   MR. WATERS: Your Honor, Tim Waters again. I  
2 actually had a slightly different issue on the same deposition,  
3 which is in line with the goal of trying to avoid the  
4 deposition of Mr. Weinberg if we can, the way the current  
5 schedule is set up, I have three day -- within three days of  
6 the documents being produced, I have to depose Mr. Weinberg.  
7 Then I have a few more days to depose Mr. Etminan.

8                   I'd like to reverse the order there because I think  
9 the easiest way for me to tell my client we don't need to  
10 depose Mr. Weinberg is I have the documents. I've taken Mr.  
11 Etminan's deposition.

12                  And if his testimony is consistent with the  
13 documents, then I think it's a very high chance I can say we  
14 don't need to depose the lawyer.

15                  If though Mr. Etminan, what I have to protect  
16 against, Your Honor, is the outside chance that any client  
17 could testify, oh, sure, the email says this, but I picked up  
18 the phone right afterwards and I told him X, Y, and Z. And he  
19 told me, oh, well then, this situation's completely different,  
20 et cetera.

21                  I'm not saying Mr. Etminan's going to do that, but if  
22 I take his deposition first, that just maximizes the chances I  
23 can avoid the deposition of Mr. Weinberg.

24                  So the ask is if I could have a week after depositing  
25 Mr. Etminan to depose Mr. Weinberg, again, not trying to draw

1 things out. I'm actually trying to narrow the scope and  
2 potentially avoid that deposition.

3 THE COURT: I'm a little unclear on what the request  
4 here is. My understanding right is that Gilead will depose Mr.  
5 Weinberg by April 25th if at all.

6 And then, by April 29th, Mr. Etminan's deposition  
7 will be re-opened, right? So, just to clarify, what are you  
8 seeking now?

9 MR. WATERS: I apologize. I would like to extend the  
10 deadline to depose Mr. Weinberg until May 6th to allow me to  
11 give that extra time and to depose Mr. Etminan first, so that I  
12 can maximize the chances that we will just cancel Mr.  
13 Weinberg's deposition.

14 THE COURT: All right, any thoughts on that from Mr.  
15 Jacobs?

16 MR. JACOBS: Well, I would love if that were the only  
17 reason to do Mr. Etminan's deposition first. I think  
18 the -- another reason may be that Gilead wants to hear what Mr.  
19 Etminan says, and then, try to elicit testimony from Mr.  
20 Weinberg that shows Mr. Etminan in a poor light let's say.

21 I think the schedule's fine as it is now. I think  
22 that, you know, Gilead -- we're likely to proceed with the two  
23 depositions. I don't think it matters which one we do first.  
24 They're both going to testify truthfully.

25 Mr. Weinberg's been a lawyer for 60-plus years. His

1 answers are going to be what his answers are going to be. So  
2 I'm fine with the schedule now.

3 I think Gilead's already served him with a subpoena  
4 for April 25th. I see no reason why we can't do Mr. Weinberg's  
5 deposition that morning and perhaps Mr. Etminan is later that  
6 afternoon in the same location, but you know, I'll leave it  
7 there.

8 MR. WATERS: Just to briefly respond, Your Honor. If  
9 this defense had been timely raised, we would have subpoenaed  
10 Mr. Weinberg and we would have, as the Plaintiffs and the  
11 people asking the deposition, we would have worked with the  
12 schedule.

13 I don't see a prejudice there. I don't think there's  
14 any right for Mr. Etminan to go second. And like I said, my  
15 concern here is just I want to not take this deposition if I  
16 don't have to (indiscernible).

17 THE COURT: Right, so I'm going to allow the  
18 deposition of Mr. Weinberg to occur by May 6th with the primary  
19 reason being that I'm hopeful this will avoid the need to  
20 depose Mr. Weinberg, because I just think as a practical  
21 matter, you know, it's something I understand the defense  
22 that's being raised, but I think the documentation is going to  
23 be the critical piece as opposed to a lawyer of advanced years  
24 testifying in a deposition.

25 So I'll enter a minute entry after this extending it

1 to May 6th. I guess I do want to kind of come back to the  
2 expert discovery piece. And I appreciate that I'm still  
3 relatively new to the case all things considered.

4 But I want to be really crystal clear with everyone  
5 that the only way I'll move any expert discovery deadlines is  
6 if truly exceptional circumstances are shown.

7 And I think the -- I've learned I suppose from what  
8 occurred in December with the fact discovery deadline that is  
9 effectively still going on here for, you know, for some  
10 purposes, that I think it's very unmanageable. And I think it  
11 creates more confusion and more unnecessary litigation.

12 So just to be really clear again with everyone, I'll  
13 make this tweak to the deadline for Mr. Weinberg's deposition,  
14 otherwise fact discovery has been addressed already.

15 And expert discovery, I'm going to stick to those  
16 deadlines. And then, this case should be ready for motion  
17 practice by mid-July, right? And then, we'll go from there.  
18 Okay, anything further from any party?

19 All right, I'm going to schedule a status conference.  
20 Does April 24th, which is a Wednesday, at 12 o'clock work  
21 Eastern Time?

22 MR. BERMAN: Your Honor, I -- this is Mark Berman. I  
23 have a conflict, but I could probably have a colleague cover it  
24 if it's just for status.

25 THE COURT: I believe that may be Passover now that

1 I'm looking at my own calendar here. I don't know if that's an  
2 issue.

3 MR. BERMAN: It actually is. It's the second day of  
4 Passover.

5 THE COURT: All right, so how about May 1st at 12  
6 o'clock?

7 MR. BERMAN: That works for me, Mark Berman.

8 MR. WATERS: No issues on the Plaintiff's side, Your  
9 Honor.

10 THE COURT: Okay, and we'll set that out. And then,  
11 I'll ask again for similar to the previous conference if  
12 there's any discovery issues that need to be addressed, if you  
13 could let me know by April 24th, again, I'm hopeful there  
14 should be no discovery issues except that the expert discovery  
15 deadlines are being worked on and that kind of thing.

16 But if there is anything, I'll note by April 24th to  
17 just file a letter in advance of the conference. Okay,  
18 anything further from anyone? All right, well, thanks,  
19 everyone. Have a nice rest of the day.

20 MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 MR. WATERS: Thank you Your Honor.

22 MR. KURLAND: Thank --

23 (Proceedings concluded at 12:32 p.m.)

24

25

## CERTIFICATE

I, Chris Hwang, court approved transcriber, certify  
that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official  
electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-  
entitled matter.

11 | /s/ *Chris Hwang*

March 29, 2024

Chris Hwang

Date

## Transcriber